

Claim 1 recites assembling at least a portion of a wafer having a main surface and a multiplicity of spaced-apart caps projecting upwardly therefrom with a terminal bearing element incorporating an array of terminals. In such way, the terminals are mounted simultaneously on the plurality of *spaced-apart caps*. An exemplary embodiment is described at paragraph [0036] of the present application "[b]y assembling the tape to the wafer, terminals and leads are assembled to a large number of caps 14 simultaneously. In the particular embodiment shown [in FIGS. 5 and 6], the terminals [36] are assembled to all of the caps [14] on the entire wafer [10] in a single operation."

In *Karpman's* method, a terminal-bearing element incorporating an array of terminals is not assembled with a wafer having spaced-apart caps so as to mount the terminals simultaneously on the plurality of spaced-apart caps. *Karpman* does not teach mounting terminal simultaneously on the plurality of spaced-apart caps. Rather, *Karpman* teaches mounting circuitry first on a cap wafer, and then separating the cap wafer into individual capped regions. Applicants assert that *Karpman* teaches away from Applicants' invention:

"After the cap wafer 20 is sealed to the substrate wafer 10, the next step in the process of the invention is to separate the cap wafer so that unnecessary portions of the cap wafer are removed and access can be gained to the underlying portions of the substrate wafer. FIG. 12 shows this step of the invention." *Karpman*, Col.5 11.50-55. [emphasis added]. This cap wafer limitation is also evident by the process flow sequence disclosed in *Karpman* as depicted in figures 6-16 and as described in the associated detailed description. *Karpman*, Col.5 11.1 - Col.6 11.24.

Additionally, the teaching of *Karpman* would lead one skilled in the art to avoid the method recited in claim 3, wherein the terminal-bearing element includes leads aligned with

channels between the spaced-apart caps. Quite clearly, *Karpman's* method would not work in the process recited in claim 3 because the wafer saw would damage the leads of the terminal bearing element which are aligned with the channels between the caps.

Further, applicants respectfully submit that the invention recited in claim 13 is not taught by *Karpman*. Similar to the discussion above, there are no depressions in the cap wafer described in *Karpman* at the time the terminal bearing element is assembled thereto. Again, *Karpman* teaches that the cap wafer is only cut *after* attaching circuitry thereto.

Based on the foregoing, *Karpman* does not anticipate either claim 1 or claim 13 of the present application. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of the § 102 rejection of claims 1 and 13. Applicants also respectfully assert that claims 2-5, 7, 8, 10, and 12 are allowable, at least because they depend from claim 1, and that claims 12-18, 20 and 21 are allowable, at least because they depend from claim 13. Applicants, therefore, respectfully request that the § 102(e) rejection of claims 1-5, 7, 8, 10, 12-18, 20 and 21 be withdrawn.

With respect to the § 103(a) rejection of claims 6 and 11 over *Karpman*, Applicants respectfully assert that claims 6 and 11 are allowable because they depend from claim 1 which, as set forth above, is believed to be allowable. Similarly, Applicants respectfully assert that claims 9 and 19 are allowable because they depend from claim 13 which, as set forth above, is believed to be allowable and because the addition of *Haba* does not overcome the deficiencies of *Karpman* with respect to claim 13. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of the § 103 rejection of claims 6, 9, 11 and 19.

As it is believed that all of the rejections set forth in the Official Action have been fully met, favorable reconsideration and allowance are earnestly solicited.

If, however, for any reason the Examiner does not believe that such action can be taken at this time, it is respectfully requested that he/she telephone applicant's attorney at (908) 654-5000 in order to overcome any additional objections which he might have.

If there are any additional charges in connection with this requested amendment, the Examiner is authorized to charge Deposit Account No. 12-1095 therefor.

Dated: October 31, 2007

Respectfully submitted,

By 

Mitchell J. Mehlman  
Registration No.: 50,916  
LERNER, DAVID, LITTENBERG,  
KRUMHOLZ & MENTLIK, LLP  
600 South Avenue West  
Westfield, New Jersey 07090  
(908) 654-5000  
Attorney for Applicant